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HIV INFECTION IN UKRAINE

Ukraine (2016)

- 240,000 people living with HIV
- 0.9% adult HIV prevalence
- 17,000 new HIV infections
- 8,500 AIDS-related deaths
- 36% adults on antiretroviral treatment
- 64% children on antiretroviral treatment

UNAIDS Data, 2017
PEOPLE WHO INJECT DRUGS (PWID) IN UKRAINE

Ukraine

- Estimated size of population: 346,900
- HIV prevalence: 21.9%
- Know their HIV status: 49%
- ART coverage: ---
- Condom use: 48%
- Clean needle use at last injection: 96.5%
- Coverage of HIV prevention programmes: 71%
- Coverage of OST: 3.2%
- Naloxone available: No
- Safe injection rooms available: No
- Avoidance of services due to stigma and discrimination: ---

UN World Drug Report, 2016
HIV IN PEOPLE WHO INJECT DRUGS (PWID)

- **Absolute number of new HIV cases among PWID**
- **Weighted ratio of PWID among the new HIV cases**

Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 2017
HIV CARE FOR PWID IN UKRAINE:
ACHIEVEMENTS

❖ Provide ART to not less than 80% of patients under supervision
❖ Decrease the mortality rate
❖ Access to OST
❖ Development of a network of specialized services
❖ Prevention of the development of HIV drug resistance
HIV CARE FOR PWID IN UKRAINE: CHALLENGES

❖ Insufficient coverage of enrollment and retention in HIV care and ART

❖ Lack of financial resources for ARVs and diagnostics

❖ War in the east of the country and political turmoil

❖ Lack of integrated services

UNAIDS GAP REPORT 2014
HIV CARE FOR PWID IN UKRAINE
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EACS 15th Conference, 2015
Health-Related Quality of Life in HIV+ PWID

- Basic goal of treatment
- Important endpoint in medical care and clinical trials
- Implementing new social support programs
To determine differences in health-related quality of life (HRQoL) among HIV infected PWID and Ukrainian healthy population.
Cross sectional study

- 60 PWID (were recruited through Sumy Regional Narcological Clinic, NGO “Club Chance”)
- 64 blood donors (Sumy Regional Blood Center)

Selection criteria

- HIV-1 infected PWID 18-55 years of age
- no active manifestations of OIs
- adherent to medical visits (two or more consecutive HIV outpatient clinic appointment over the past year)
METHODS

❖ Questionnaires:

- Socio-demographic data
- Behavioural factors
- Health-related quality of life
HRQoL TOOL

- Number of items – 28
- Domains – 4
- Reliability and validity: Content, construct validity
  Pilot test (30 blood donors)
  Cronbach’s $\alpha$ - 0.7
  Test-retest reliability - 0.66
### Socio-Demographics for Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIV+ PWID (n=60)</th>
<th>Blood donors (n=64)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (n, %)</td>
<td>45 (75.0)</td>
<td>51 (79.7)</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years, mean±SD)</td>
<td>34.04±2.4</td>
<td>32.44±3.1</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban residence (n, %)</td>
<td>57 (95.0)</td>
<td>56 (87.5)</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status (n, %):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21 (35.0)</td>
<td>11 (17.2)</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Living with partner</td>
<td>39 (65.0)</td>
<td>53 (82.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (n, %):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>51 (85.0)</td>
<td>39 (60.9)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>9 (15.0)</td>
<td>25 (39.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (n, %)</td>
<td>34 (56.7)</td>
<td>38 (59.4)</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HIV INFECTED PWID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIV+ PWID (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of HIV (years, mean+SD)</strong></td>
<td>6.2±5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner status (n, %):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV-negative</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV-positive</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART (n, %)</strong></td>
<td>53 (88.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OST (Opioid substitution therapy) (n, %)</strong></td>
<td>55 (91.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recent CD4 (median/μL, IQR)</strong></td>
<td>368 [182-544]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viral suppressed (n, %)</strong></td>
<td>47 (78.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCV infection (n, %)</strong></td>
<td>40 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol abuse (n, %)</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRQoL: summary score

p<0.01

HIV+ PWID
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### HRQoL: study groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIV+ PWID (n=60)</th>
<th>Blood donors (n=64)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the viability (n, %)</td>
<td>30 (50.0)</td>
<td>9 (14.1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation (n, %)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (n, %)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.7)</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain (n, %)</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal stigma (n, %)</td>
<td>46 (76.7)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in plans for future (n, %)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of death (n, %)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline capacity to work (n, %)</td>
<td>27 (45.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRQoL in HIV infected PWID remains lower than in the general population, but corresponds to a satisfactory level.

Low level of HRQoL among PWID living with HIV is largely due to social and spiritual components.
Perspective of future studies

- the role of “social inequality factors”
- HRQoL in PWID non-retained in HIV care
LIMITATIONS

❖ Selection bias
❖ Erroneous, missing data
❖ Unmeasured confounding
❖ Study instrument
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